

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action, and for the acknowledgement that the drawings are acceptable. Applicant additionally wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the materials cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application on August 22, 2006, by the return of the signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 attached to the Official Action.

Applicant notes, however, that the Official Action did not acknowledge Applicant's claim of foreign priority, or that the certified copy of the priority document has been received. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests such acknowledgement in the next Official communication.

In the Official Action, claims 23, 26, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 23-27, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 42, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by WILSON et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0021265 A1). Claims 28-30, 33, 35, 39-41, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILSON in view of IZAWA et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0103563 A1).

Upon entry of the amendment, claims 24-25, 27-29, 32-33, 35-36, 38 and 40-41 have been amended, and new claims 45-53 have been submitted for the Examiner's consideration. Claims 23, 26, 31, 34, 37, 39, and 42-44 have been cancelled. Claims 1-22 were previously cancelled. Thus, claims 24-25, 27-30, 32-33, 35-36, 38, 40-41, and 45-53 are currently pending for consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 23, 26, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Official Action asserted that the expression “each of information recording portions” lacks a proper functional antecedent basis. Claims 23, 26, and 31 have been cancelled by this amendment. Thus, the rejection of claim 23, 26, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is now moot.

Claims 23-27, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 42, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by WILSON. Independent claims 23, 26, 31, 34, 37, 42, and 44 have been cancelled, and have been replaced by new claims 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, and 53, respectively. Applicant submits that each of new claims 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, and 53 recite features that are not disclosed by WILSON.

For instance, new independent method claim 45 explicitly recites the producing of a multi-piece substrate comprising a plurality of substrate sheets, with each substrate sheet comprising a plurality of substrate pieces, and wherein the multi-piece substrate is configured to be separated at one or each of a plurality of separation levels. Claim 45 also recites configuring the multi-piece substrate to include an information recording portion that includes information related to the entire multi-piece substrate, wherein each substrate sheet is configured with an information recording portion that includes information related to the entire multi-piece substrate and information related to the identification of the substrate sheet. Claim 45 further recites that each substrate piece is configured with an information recording portion that includes information related to the entire multi-piece substrate, information related to a substrate sheet, and information related to the identification of the substrate piece.

Applicant submits that WILSON fails to disclose both the specific configuration of a multi-piece substrate having progressively detailed identification information provided in the information recording portions at the progressively smaller portions of the multi-piece substrate,

as discussed above. In contrast, WILSON discloses in the Abstract and the cited paragraph [0033] that his system is directed to tracking IC devices through the assembly steps in a manufacturing process, wherein the location codes are constantly being updated.

Claim 45 additionally recites that at the substrate manufacturer, both management and manufacturing information related to the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer, are recorded on the information recording portions. Applicant submits that WILSON fails to disclose the recording of both management and manufacturing information related to both the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer in the manner recited in claim 45.

New claims 46-49 recite features similar to claim 45. Thus, Applicant similarly submits that WILSON fails to disclose each and every feature of new claim 46-49 as well. Furthermore, in addition to reciting that at the substrate manufacturer, both management and manufacturing information related to the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer are recorded on the information recording portions, new independent claims 51 and 53 each recite more specific details regarding the management and manufacturing information. More particularly, claims 51 and 53 each explicitly recite that the management and manufacturing information includes mounting manufacturer management information, substrate manufacturer management information, a manufacturing lot number, the total number of substrates included in the lot, a substrate sequence number, a substrate sheet code, and a substrate piece code, which WILSON does not disclose.

Since WILSON fails to disclose each and every feature recited in new independent claims 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, and 53, Applicant submits that WILSON does not anticipate the cited new independent claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by WILSON be withdrawn.

Claims 28-30, 33, 35, 39-41, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILSON in view of IZAWA. Independent claims 39 and 43 have been cancelled, and replaced by new independent claims 50 and 52, respectively. Applicants submits that the combination of WILSON and IZAWA fail to render obvious the features recited in new independent claim 50 and 52.

New independent claim 50 explicitly recites that the production and identification information from the substrate manufacturer includes information related to an entire multi-piece substrate, information related to one of a plurality of substrate sheets that comprise the multi-piece substrate, and information related to the identification of one of a plurality of substrate pieces that comprise the substrate piece. Claim 50 also recites that the identification information includes management and manufacturing information related to both the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer, and that the data processing center processes the combined information from both the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer. For reasons similar to those previously discussed, Applicant submits that WILSON fails to disclose a method that utilizes the specific information recited above in the manner claimed. Applicant also submits that IZAWA fails to remedy the deficiencies of WILSON.

New independent claim 52 explicitly recites that the substrate manufacturer records identification information on an information recording portion of a substrate that includes both management and manufacturing information related to both the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer. Claim 52 also recites that the data processing center processes the information received from both the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer. Claim 52 further recites that data from the various databases are retrieved by both the substrate manufacturer and the mounting manufacturer for further processing. Applicant submits that at

least the above discussed features are not disclosed by either WILSON, IZAWA, or the combination thereof.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits new independent claims 50 and 52 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WILSON in view of IZAWA be withdrawn.


SUMMARY

From the amendments, arguments, and remarks provided above, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims in the present application are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action is respectfully requested and an indication of the allowance of claims 24-25, 27-30, 32-33, 35-36, 38, 40-41, and 45-53 is now believed to be appropriate.

Applicant notes that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance, and should not be considered as surrendering equivalents of the territory between the claims prior to the present amendment and the amended claims. Further, no acquiescence as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections is made by the present amendment. All other amendments to the claims which have been made by this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Tokumi KOBAYASHI



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Steven Wegman
Reg. No. 31,438

May 26, 2009
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191